

## REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the examiner for the many courtesies extended in the telephone interview of June 23, 2008, wherein the undersigned and the examiner discussed the invention as claimed by independent claim 1 and dependent claim 8 in view of Miller, and further in view of the specification as originally filed. In response to said interview, and to the office action letter of May 9, 2008, applicants hereby amend the application. However, it is to be understood that applicant is not conceding that any of the cancelled claims, or any previous submitted claims now amended, are not patentable in view of statutory interpretations or over the prior art cited by the Examiner. The present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of allowable subject matter, and applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC Sec 101*

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 11 has been canceled, and the examiner's rejection believed moot.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC Sec 102*

Claims 1-4, 6-7 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6915457 B1 to Miller, hereinafter Miller. Prior art is anticipatory only if every element of the claimed invention is disclosed in a single item of prior art in the form literally defined in the claim. Jamesbury Corp. v. Litton Indus. Products, 756 F.2d 1556, 225 USPQ 253 (Fed. Cir. 1985); Atlas Powder Co. v. du Pont, 750 F.2d 1569, 224 USPQ 409 (Fed. Cir. 1984); American Hospital Supply v. Travenol Labs, 745 F.2d 1, 223 USPQ 577 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Anticipation requires identity of the claimed process and a process of the prior art; the claimed process, including each step thereof, must have been described or embodied, either expressly or inherently, in a single reference. Glaverbel Societe Anonyme v. Northlake Marketing & Supply, Inc., 45 F. 3d 1550, 1554, 33 USPQ2d 1496, 1498 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate limitations of claim 8 as well as additional limitations supported by the specification and, as amended, claim 1 now claims limitations not taught or disclosed by Miller. More particularly, applicants wish to thank the examiner for the

many courtesies extended in the telephone interview of June 23, 2008, wherein the undersigned and the examiner discussed the invention as claimed by independent claim 1 and dependent claim 8 in view of Miller, and further in view of the specification as originally filed.

More particularly, it was generally discussed in said interview that amending method limitations present in claims 1 and 8 to correspond to subject matter appearing in the original specification at pages 13 and 14, as well as moving some limitations out of the preamble of original claim 1, may render the resulting claim(s) allowable in view of the prior art of record. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 8, and further to claim splitting and sharing routing information among several routers within a group of routers, each of the routers acting as a single border router in an Internet protocol network and comprising a routing table. The method further comprising comparing a routing table size to a predefined *threshold*, and in response to *exceeding* the predefined threshold *splitting* a router's routing table into a *plurality of subnetworks*, with *another* of the routers taking responsibility for routing IP traffic intended for one of the split subnetworks *by informing* each of the other routers that it is ready to receive the IP traffic from the each of the other routers directed to the one subnetwork; *in response* to the informing, each of *the other routers selecting and removing* from their own routing table a route related to the one subnetwork *and replacing* the removed route by a *single route pointing* to the informing second router.

The present amendments to claim 1 are supported by the claims as originally filed as well as by the specification at paragraph 47 (beginning at page 13 and ending on page 14). Claims 2-3, 5-7 and 9 are all directly or indirectly dependent upon and include all of the limitations of amended claim 1, and claims 4, 8 and 10-11 have been cancelled. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9 are all now believed to be allowable under 35 USC § 102 over Miller.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC Sec 103***

Claims 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Miller in view of U.S. 2002/0118682 A1 (Choe), or over Miller in view of U.S. Patent 7065587 B2 (Huitema et al), respectively. To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the

claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. MPEP §706.02(j), citing Ex parte Clapp, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Claim 5 is directly dependent upon and includes all of the limitations of amended claim 1, and claim 8 has been cancelled. As discussed above, and in the examiner interview of June 23, 2008, amended claim 1 is now believed to claim subject matter allowable over Miller in view of Choe or in view of Huitema et al under 35 USC § 103, as the references fail to expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention, and the examiner has not presented a convincing line of reasoning as to why an artisan would have found the claimed invention(s) to have been obvious in light of the teachings of Miller in view of Choe/Huitema et al.

### ***Conclusion***

Thus, all claims in the application are believed to be in condition for allowance, and early issuance of an appropriate Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 25, 2008

/Patrick J. Daugherty/  
Patrick J. Daugherty, Reg. No. 41,697  
CUSTOMER NO. 26681